

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,631	12/14/2001		Jeanette McCarthy	MMI-006	6400
959	7590	11/04/2003		EXAMINER	
LAHIVE		FIELD	MARTINELL, JAMES		
28 STATE STREET BOSTON, MA 02109				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
, .				1631	
				DATE MAILED: 11/04/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•							
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/017,631	MCCARTHY, JEANETTE					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	James Martinell	1631					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute.  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered timely. Ithe mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u> </u>						
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) Th	is action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.  Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-123</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) 1-123 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.							
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.							
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
<ul> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International But</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list</li> </ul>	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	_					
14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti	•						
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.							
15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.							
Attachment(s)							
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)</li> </ol>	5) Notice of Informal	y (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)					

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-23, 35-40, 43-50, and 55-65, drawn to nucleic acid assays, classified in class
   435, subclass 6.
- II. Claims 24-32, 74, and 75, drawn to computer readable media and electronic systems containing biological data, classified in class 702, subclass 19.
- III. Claims 33, 34, 66-73, 76-92, and 94-123, drawn to methods for assessing risk for disease, classified in class 702, subclass 19.
- IV. Claims 41 and 42, drawn to methods of treatment using compounds of undisclosed nature, classified in class unknown, subclass unknown.
- V. Claims 51-54, drawn to nucleic acids and kits, classified in class 536, subclasses 23.1 and 23.5.
- VI. Claim 93, drawn to methods of making a request for information and passing along the information received, classified in class unknown, subclass unknown.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other for the following reasons. The methods of Group I may be practiced independently of the methods of each of Groups III, IV, and VI. The nucleic acids and kits of Group V have uses other than in the methods of Group I (e.g., in affinity chromatography). The computer readable media and electronic systems of Group II have uses other than in the methods of Group III (e.g., for complex computations not related to gene F2). The computer readable media and electronic systems of Group II are not needed to practice the methods of either of Groups IV or VI. The computer readable media and electronic systems of Group II are materially different from and are therefore independent and distinct from the nucleic acids and kits of Group V. The methods of each of Groups III, IV, and VI may be practiced independently of one another. The nucleic acids and kits of Group V are not needed to practice the methods of any one of Groups III, IV, or V.

Application/Control Number: 10/017,631 Page 3

Art Unit: 1631

To search any two groups as outlined above would create an undue burden for the U.S. PTO because the searches of the non-patent literature are not only non-overlapping to any appreciable extent, but are also divergent in nature.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their different classification and recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

## Reminder Regarding In re Ochiai and In re Brouwer

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner bee the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Martinell whose telephone number is (703) 308-0296. The fax phone number for Examiner Martinell's desktop workstation is (703) 746-5162. The examiner works a flexible schedule and can be reached by phone and voice mail. Alternatively, a request for a return telephone call may be e-

Application/Control Number: 10/017,631

Art Unit: 1631

mailed to <u>james.martinell@uspto.gov</u>. Since e-mail communications may not be secure, it is suggested that information in such requests be limited to name, phone number, and the best time to return the call.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward, can be reached on (703) 305-4028.

## PLEASE NOTE THE NEW FAX NUMBER

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

James Martinell, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1631

Page 4